



*South Dakota  
Department of Corrections*

*and*

*Council of Juvenile Services*

# **JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM**

*Disproportionate Minority Contact Report*

*December 2005*

<b>I</b>	<b>Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Formula Grants Program</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>A Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>B Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>C South Dakota's Participation</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>D Council of Juvenile Services</b>	<b>5</b>
	1 Membership Requirements	5
	2 Council of Juvenile Services Responsibilities	6
	3 DMC Committee and Workgroups	7
<b>II</b>	<b>Disproportionate Minority Contact Identification</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>A Overview</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>B Data</b>	<b>9</b>
	1 Population	9
	2 Arrests	10
	3 Detention	11
	4 Petitions Filed	11
	5 Adjudications	12
	6 Dispositions to Probation	13
	7 Dispositions to Detention	14
	8 DOC Commitment	15
	9 DOC Secure Placement	16
	10 DOC Secure Temporary Custody	17
	11 DOC Revocation	18
<b>III</b>	<b>Disproportionate Minority Contact Assessment</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>A Qualitative Assessment</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>B Quantitative Assessment</b>	<b>23</b>
	1 Arrest	23
	2 Detention	24
	3 Adjudication of Adolescents	26
	4 Dispositions	27
	5 Commitment to DOC	28
	6 Initial Placement by DOC	28
	7 DOC Out-of-State Placement	29
	8 Placement Following Revocation of Aftercare by DOC.	29
<b>IV</b>	<b>Disproportionate Minority Contact Intervention</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>A Statewide</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>B Sioux Falls/Minnehaha County</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>C Rapid City/Pennington County</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>D Sisseton/Roberts County</b>	<b>39</b>

## **I Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Formula Grants Program**

### **A Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act**

Since its passage in 1974, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act has changed the way states and communities deal with troubled youth. The goals of the Act and of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) are to help state and local governments prevent and control juvenile delinquency and to improve the juvenile justice system. This is accomplished by protecting juveniles in the juvenile justice system from inappropriate placements and harm with an emphasis placed on the need for community-based treatment for juvenile offenders.

The JJDP Act, through the 2002 reauthorization, establishes four core protections with which participating States and territories must develop and implement strategies for achieving and maintaining compliance with the requirements in order to receive grants under the JJDP Act:

- Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO) – removal of status offenders and non offenders from secure juvenile detention and correctional facilities and the removal of all juveniles from jails and lockups for adult offenders
- Separation – provide separation between adult and juveniles in institutional settings
- Jail Removal – removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups
- Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC), reduction of minority over-representation where it exists within the juvenile justice system

Meeting the core protections is essential to creating a fair, consistent, and effective juvenile justice system that advances the important goals of the JJDP Act.

### **B Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)**

In 1988, Congress took note of this problem by focusing state attention on the phenomenon of disproportionate minority confinement in the juvenile justice system. In 1992, Congress required states to address disproportionate minority confinement as a condition for receiving 25 percent of the state's Formula Grants

program allocation, making it the fourth and final core protection of the JJDP Act. The 1992 amendments required states to determine if minority juveniles are disproportionately confined in secure detention and correctional facilities and, if so, to address any features of their juvenile justice systems that may account for the disproportionate confinement of minority juveniles. This core requirement neither required nor established numerical standards or quotas in order for a state to achieve or maintain compliance. Rather, it required states to identify whether minority juveniles are disproportionately detained or confined in secure facilities, provide a complete assessment of why disproportionate minority confinement exists, and provide an intervention plan that seeks to reduce the disproportionate confinement of minority juveniles in secure facilities.

As amended by the JJDP Act of 2002, the concept of disproportionate minority confinement has been broadened to address the disproportionate numbers of minority youth who come into contact with any point of the juvenile justice system. The 2002 Act requires states to “address juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of the minority groups, who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.”

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has been authorized to administer the Formula Grants program to support state and local delinquency prevention and intervention efforts and juvenile justice system improvements. The program is authorized under Title II, Part B, Section 222, of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended (Public Law 93-415, 42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.).

- **Identify** the existence/extent of disproportionality through “between race” comparisons within jurisdictions and at specific decision points in the system
- **Assess** data about DMC to target detailed studies by identifying points of needed intervention, and allocate resources for system interventions

- **Intervene** to reduce DMC by assisting policymakers in choosing jurisdictions that should receive increased attention and intervention
- **Evaluate** how DMC responds to policy initiatives and system interventions
- **Monitor** trends in DMC within and across jurisdictions

## **C South Dakota's Participation**

With the strong support of Governor M. Michael Rounds, the 2003 South Dakota legislature passed two bills, Senate Bill 8 and Senate Bill 202. These bills, along with recent amendments to the JJDP Act, as reauthorized in 2002, allow South Dakota to once again participate in the Formula Grants Program of the JJDP Act. Senate Bill 8 reconstitutes the State Advisory Group (SAG), called the "Council of Juvenile Services," and assigns duties to the Council. Senate Bill 202 made the necessary changes in state law to bring South Dakota into compliance with the JJDP Act as reauthorized in 2002. The provisions of Senate Bill 202 designate the South Dakota Department of Corrections as the state agency responsible for administering the formula grant programs, effective July 1, 2003.

## **D Council of Juvenile Services**

As lead agency in this initiative, the Department of Corrections works closely with the Council of Juvenile Services, committees of the Council, and workgroups to implement the Formula Grants Program within South Dakota.

### **1 Membership Requirements**

The Council of Juvenile Services is the state advisory group for the State's participation in the formula grants program of the JJDP Act.

The Council of Juvenile Services consists of 20 Governor-appointed members who have training, experience, or special knowledge of juvenile delinquency prevention or treatment or of the administration of juvenile justice. At least one member is a locally elected official

representing general purpose local government. At least one-fifth of the members shall be under the age of 24 at the time of appointment. At least three members shall have been or currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. A chairperson, who may not be a full-time federal, state, or local employee, for the Council of Juvenile Services shall be chosen annually by a majority vote of its members at the first meeting each fiscal year.

## **2 Council of Juvenile Services Responsibilities**

Formula grant guidelines require the state advisory group to approve the state's Three-Year Plan and Formula Grant Application prior to submission to the OJJDP. The group also approves grant applications and funding decisions involving the use of formula grant funds. The advisory group is responsible for submitting an annual report to the governor and legislature that includes recommendations regarding state compliance with the requirements of the Act and a review of progress and accomplishments of projects funded under the state plan.

SDCL 1-15-30 outlines the responsibilities of the Council of Juvenile Services as follows:

- (1) In conjunction with the secretary of the Department of Corrections, establish policy on how the formula grants program of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act is to be administered in South Dakota;
- (2) Approve the state plan, and any modifications thereto, required by 223(a) of the Act prior to submission to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention;
- (3) Submit annual recommendations to the Governor and Legislature concerning the functions of the Council of Juvenile Services and the status of the state's compliance with the Act;
- (4) Approve or disapprove grant applications and other funding requests submitted to the Department of Corrections under § §

1-15-27 to 1-15-31, inclusive, and assist with monitoring grants and other fund awards;

- (5) Assist the Department of Corrections in monitoring the state's compliance with the Act;
- (6) Study the coordination of the various juvenile intervention, prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs;
- (7) Study effective juvenile sentencing, adjudication, and diversion policies and provisions;
- (8) Make a special study of, and make an annual report to the Governor, the Unified Judicial System, and the Legislature by June thirtieth of each year concerning, the appropriate administration of and provision for children in need of supervision in this state;
- (9) Contact and seek regular input from juveniles currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system; and
- (10) Perform other such activities as determined by the Governor, the secretary of the Department of Corrections, or the Council of Juvenile Services.

### **3 DMC Committee and Workgroups**

The Council of Juvenile Services has created three committees to monitor, research, and make recommendations to the Council on key program components. These three committees include Systems and Services Committee, Compliance Monitoring Committee, and Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Committee. Additional committees and workgroups are formed as needed to address other issues.

The DMC Committee is comprised of Council members and other nonmembers that have taken an interest in DMC in South Dakota. This group has met to learn about and discuss identification and assessment information with researchers and staff. Based on these discussions, the DMC Committee determined that addressing DMC on a statewide basis

required local interventions to obtain positive results. The DMC Committee recommended to the Council that DMC Intervention Workgroups be formed in Sioux Falls, Rapid City, and Sisseton.

As DMC Workgroups, each of the three groups were asked to develop and submit community specific DMC Intervention Plans to the DMC Committee and the Council for funding consideration by October 2005. A summary of the recommendations for each community can be found in the Disproportionate Minority Contact Intervention section of this document.

## **II Disproportionate Minority Contact Identification**

### **A Overview**

The purpose of the Identification Phase of a State's DMC effort is to determine if minority youth are overrepresented in the State's juvenile justice system. By collecting and examining data on the numbers of youth at each stage, a State can determine whether overrepresentation exists, where it exists, and the degree of overrepresentation at these points within the State's juvenile justice system.

In Fiscal Year 2005, South Dakota completed the identification phase of the DMC process. Based on data collected from the Attorney General's Division of Criminal Investigation, the Unified Judicial System, and the Department of Corrections, DMC was found to exist in South Dakota's juvenile justice system. The arrest stage was found to exhibit the most evidence of minority overrepresentation within the juvenile system.

### **B Data**

#### **1 Population**

Based on United States Census Data provided by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, there were 195,426 juveniles under the age of 18 residing in South Dakota in 2003. Of these juveniles, 17.5% were minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (1.6%) and Native American (15.1%) youth.

Statewide Population		
	Total	%
White	161,133	82.5%
Black	3,120	1.6%
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0%
Asian	1,706	0.9%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	29,467	15.1%
Other/Unknown	0	0.0%
All Minorities	34,293	17.5%
Total	195,426	

## 2 Arrests

According to Division of Criminal Investigation arrest information, there were 8,571 juveniles arrested in South Dakota in 2003. Of these juveniles, 33.0% were minority youth with the largest populations being comprised of Black (3.1%) and Native American (29.4%) youth.

Statewide Arrests		
	Total	%
White	5,745	67.0%
Black	262	3.1%
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0%
Asian	43	0.5%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	2,521	29.4%
Other/Unknown	0	0.0%
All Minorities	2,826	33.0%
Total	8,571	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles arrested and the total juvenile population. The arrest rate for white juveniles was 35.65 per 1,000 youth in the population. The arrest rate for Native American youth was 85.55 per 1,000 youth in the population. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 2.40. This means the arrest rate for Native American youth was 2.40 times higher than the arrest rate for White youth, which is at a level indicating statistical significance—that the differences are not likely due to chance.

### 3 Detention

According to juvenile admission records, there were 3,169 juveniles admitted to secure holding facilities in South Dakota in 2003. Of these juveniles, 44.1% were Minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (3.7%) and Native American (39.2%) youth.

Statewide Detention		
	Total	%
White	1,750	55.2%
Black	116	3.7%
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0%
Asian	39	1.2%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1,243	39.2%
Other/Unknown	21	0.7%
All Minorities	1,398	44.1%
Total	3,169	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles in detention and the total number of arrests. The detention rate for white juveniles was 30.46 per 100 youth arrested. The detention rate for Native American youth was 49.31 per 100 youth arrested. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 1.62. This means the detention rate for Native American youth was 1.62 times higher than the detention rate for White youth, which is at a level indicating statistical significance.

### 4 Petitions Filed

According to records from the Unified Judicial System, there were 6,557 juvenile petitions in South Dakota in 2003. Of these juveniles, 17.7% were Minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (1.4%) and Native American (15.8%) youth. However, it must also be noted that 2,600 records (39.7%) of the total records reviewed had race information recorded as other, unknown, or were missing race information.

Statewide Petitions		
	Total	%
White	2,799	42.7%
Black	93	1.4%
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0%
Asian	29	0.4%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1,036	15.8%
Other/Unknown	2,600	39.7%
All Minorities	1,158	17.7%
Total	6,557	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles in petitions filed and the total number of arrests. The rate for petitions filed for white juveniles was 48.72 per 100 youth arrested. The rate for petitions filed for Native American youth was 41.09 per 100 youth arrested. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 0.84. This means the rate for petitions filed for White youth was 1.19 times higher than the rate for petitions filed for Native American youth, which is at a level indicating statistical significance.

## 5 Adjudications

According to records from the Unified Judicial System, there were 5,527 juvenile adjudications in South Dakota in 2003. Of these juveniles, 17.7% were Minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (1.3%) and Native American (16.0%) youth. However, it must also be noted that 1,912 records (34.6%) of the total records reviewed had race information recorded as other, unknown, or were missing race information.

<b>Statewide Adjudications</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>White</b>	2,635	47.7%
<b>Black</b>	73	1.3%
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	0	0.0%
<b>Asian</b>	25	0.5%
<b>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b>	0	0.0%
<b>American Indian/Alaska Native</b>	882	16.0%
<b>Other/Unknown</b>	1,912	34.6%
<b>All Minorities</b>	980	17.7%
<b>Total</b>	5,527	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles in adjudications and the total number of petitions filed. The adjudication rate for white juveniles was 94.14 per 100 youth with petitions filed. The adjudication rate for Native American youth was 85.14 per 100 youth with petitions filed. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 0.90. This means the adjudication rate for White youth was 1.11 times higher than the adjudication rate for Native American youth, which is at a level indicating statistical significance.

## **6 Dispositions to Probation**

According to records from the Unified Judicial System, there were 3,234 juvenile dispositions to probation in South Dakota in 2003. Of these juveniles, 21.7% were Minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (1.1%) and Native American (20.1%) youth. However, it must also be noted that 910 records (28.1%) of the total records reviewed had race information recorded as other, unknown, or were missing race information.

<b>Statewide Probation Dispositions</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>White</b>	1,621	50.1%
<b>Black</b>	36	1.1%
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	0	0.0%
<b>Asian</b>	17	0.5%
<b>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b>	0	0.0%
<b>American Indian/Alaska Native</b>	650	20.1%
<b>Other/Unknown</b>	910	28.1%
<b>All Minorities</b>	703	21.7%
<b>Total</b>	3,234	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles placed on probation and the total number of adjudications. The probation rate for white juveniles was 61.52 per 100 youth adjudicated. The probation rate for Native American youth was 73.70 per 100 youth adjudicated. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 1.20. This means the probation rate for Native American youth was 1.20 times higher than the probation rate for White youth, which is at a level indicating statistical significance.

## **7 Dispositions to Detention**

According to records from the Unified Judicial System, there were 1,527 juvenile dispositions to detention South Dakota in 2003. Of these juveniles, 23.4% were Minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (1.8%) and Native American (20.9%) youth. However, it must also be noted 374 records (24.5%) of the total records reviewed had race information recorded as other, unknown, or were missing race information.

<b>Statewide Detention Dispositions</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>White</b>	796	52.1%
<b>Black</b>	28	1.8%
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	0	0.0%
<b>Asian</b>	10	0.7%
<b>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b>	0	0.0%
<b>American Indian/Alaska Native</b>	319	20.9%
<b>Other/Unknown</b>	374	24.5%
<b>All Minorities</b>	357	23.4%
<b>Total</b>	1,527	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles placed in detention as a disposition and the total number of adjudications. The detention as a disposition rate for white juveniles was 30.21 per 100 youth adjudicated. The detention as a disposition rate for Native American youth was 36.17 per 100 youth adjudicated. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 1.20. This means the detention as a disposition rate for Native American youth was 1.20 times higher than the detention as a disposition rate for White youth, which is at a level indicating statistical significance.

## **8 DOC Commitment**

According to records from the Department of Corrections, there were 381 juvenile commitments to the Department of Corrections in 2003. Of these juveniles, 47.2% were Minority youth with the largest population being made up of Native American (41.2%) youth.

Statewide DOC Commitments		
	Total	%
White	201	52.8%
Black	7	1.8%
Hispanic or Latino	8	2.1%
Asian	8	2.1%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	157	41.2%
Other/Unknown	0	0.0%
All Minorities	180	47.2%
Total	381	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles committed to the Department of Corrections and the total number of adjudications. The commitment rate for white juveniles was 7.63 per 100 youth adjudicated. The commitment rate for Native American youth was 17.80 per 100 youth adjudicated. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 2.33. This means the commitment rate for Native American youth was 2.33 times higher than the commitment rate for White youth, which is at a level that indicates statistical significance.

## 9 DOC Secure Placement

According to records from the Department of Corrections, there were 82 juveniles held in secure placements in 2003 who had been committed to the Department of Corrections from Minnehaha County. Of these juveniles, 54.9% were Minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (8.5%) and Native American (46.3%) youth.

<b>Statewide DOC Cases Resulting in Secure Placement</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>White</b>	37	45.1%
<b>Black</b>	7	8.5%
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	0	0.0%
<b>Asian</b>	0	0.0%
<b>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b>	0	0.0%
<b>American Indian/Alaska Native</b>	38	46.3%
<b>Other/Unknown</b>	0	0.0%
<b>All Minorities</b>	45	54.9%
<b>Total</b>	82	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles placed by the Department of Corrections in secure facilities and the total Department of Corrections juvenile caseload. The secure placement rate for white juveniles was 5.56 per 100 youth on the DOC caseload. The secure placement rate for Native American youth was 8.86 per 100 youth on the DOC caseload. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 1.59. This means the secure placement rate for Native American youth was 1.59 times higher than the secure placement rate for White youth, which is at a level indicating statistical significance.

## **10 DOC Secure Temporary Custody**

According to records from the Department of Corrections, there were 340 juveniles held in secure temporary custody in 2003, who had been committed to the Department of Corrections. Of these juveniles, 45.6% were Minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (5.3%) and Native American (40.0%) youth.

<b>Statewide DOC Cases Resulting in Secure Temporary Custody</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>White</b>	180	52.9%
<b>Black</b>	18	5.3%
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	1	0.3%
<b>Asian</b>	0	0.0%
<b>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b>	0	0.0%
<b>American Indian/Alaska Native</b>	136	40.0%
<b>Other/Unknown</b>	5	1.5%
<b>All Minorities</b>	155	45.6%
<b>Total</b>	340	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles placed by the Department of Corrections in secure temporary custody facilities and the total Department of Corrections juvenile caseload. The secure temporary custody placement rate for white juveniles was 27.03 per 100 youth on the DOC caseload. The secure temporary custody placement rate for Native American youth was 31.70 per 100 youth on the DOC caseload. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 1.17. This means the secure temporary custody placement rate for Native American youth was 1.17 times higher than the secure temporary custody placement rate for White youth, which is at a level not indicating statistical significance.

## **11 DOC Revocation**

According to records from the Department of Corrections, there were 226 juveniles that received aftercare revocations in 2003 who had been committed to the Department of Corrections. Of these juveniles, 39.8% were Minority youth with the largest populations being made up by Black (1.3%) and Native American (37.2%) youth.

<b>Statewide DOC Cases Resulting in Revocation</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>White</b>	134	59.3%
<b>Black</b>	3	1.3%
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	2	0.9%
<b>Asian</b>	1	0.4%
<b>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b>	0	0.0%
<b>American Indian/Alaska Native</b>	84	37.2%
<b>Other/Unknown</b>	2	0.9%
<b>All Minorities</b>	90	39.8%
<b>Total</b>	226	

Based on these numbers, a comparison was done for juveniles receiving aftercare revocations by the Department of Corrections and the total Department of Corrections juvenile aftercare caseload. The revocation rate for white juveniles was 20.97 per 100 youth on the DOC aftercare caseload. The revocation rate for Native American youth was 25.23 per 100 youth on the DOC aftercare caseload. In comparing these rates, the Relative Rate Index (RRI) is 1.20. This means the revocation rate for Native American youth was 1.20 times higher than the revocation rate for White youth, which is at a level not indicating statistical significance.

### **III Disproportionate Minority Contact Assessment**

The assessment stage of the DMC process requires a more in-depth look at and understanding of the discrepancies between white and minority youth at the various decision points in the juvenile justice system. The focus of the Assessment Phase is on why minority overrepresentation exists.

Mountain Plains Research was contracted to conduct an assessment of DMC in order to assist the Council in identifying interventions that can reduce the occurrence of DMC. Mountain Plains Research conducted a quantitative study and a qualitative study to complete the assessment process.

#### **A Qualitative Assessment**

As part of the DMC Assessment Phase, South Dakota Department of Corrections (DOC) and the researchers from Mountain Plains Research worked to conduct focus group sessions throughout South Dakota. Twelve focus groups were held with the sites including Custer, Rapid City, Sioux Falls, and Sisseton. Ninety-two participants including parents, service providers, juvenile justice practitioners, and youth took part in the focus groups. The focus groups were formed to obtain a relatively proportional representation of participants, based on age, geographic location, gender, and race/ethnicity. Besides demographic characteristics, participants were selected based on their ability to function well in group settings and their availability and willingness to participate.

The specific aims of the focus groups were to assess participants' perceptions of four main topics:

- Is there racial/ethnic bias in the juvenile justice system in South Dakota?
- If so, at what point in the system is there disproportionate minority contact?
- What factors contribute to disproportionate minority contact?
- What are the solutions to disproportionate minority contact?

## 1 Where in the System is there Bias?

Based on the focus group responses, the youth and parents who believe that there is bias in the system, indicated that the persons most likely to be unfair or biased were law enforcement, state's attorney, and judges. Some youth being monitored closely while on probation indicated that their Court Service Officers (CSOs) were unfair. Some youth and parents from both the minority and dominant culture indicated unfair treatment at each stage in the juvenile justice system. Most expressed favorable opinions about CSOs and Juvenile Corrections Agents (JCA's).

## 2 Reasons for Disproportionate Minority Contact

Based on the discussions within the focus groups, the researchers were able to identify the following reasons for DMC in South Dakota as identified by focus group participants:

- Prejudice/Biased Treatment of Minorities
  - Law Enforcement Focus on Minorities
  - Pervasive Racism in All Systems
  - Fatalism-Racism is Here to Stay
  - Prejudice - Flip Side
- Different Laws, Mores, and Cultural Values between Reservation and Non-Reservation Areas
- Inconsistent Family Life/Structure
- Difficult to Adopt Native American Children
- Truancy and Dropout Rates
- Substance Abuse
- Environment-Loss of Culture/Identity
- Education Differences
- Gangs
- Negative Media Portrayal of Minorities
- Legacy of Boarding Schools Among Native Americans
- Law Enforcement is Reactive to Complaints

- Poverty/Poor Economics/Jobs
- Native Americans More Forthright

For more information on any of these reasons, see the publication “Assessment of Disproportionate Minority Contact in South Dakota” written by Gary R. Leonardson and Roland Loudenburg from Mountain Plains Research and Evaluation (2005) which is available through the South Dakota Department of Corrections.

### 3 Solutions to Reduce Delinquency and/or DMC

Based on the discussions within the focus groups, the researchers were able to identify the following solutions to reduce delinquency and DMC in South Dakota:

- Cultural Sensitivity/Diversity Training
- Hold Adults Accountable
- Spiritual Aspects Need to be Part of the Solution
- Break the Cycle of Negativity
- Mentoring Programs
- Tribal Truancy Courts
- Better Communication between Leaders in Reservation Communities and Non-Reservation Communities
- Teach Native American Culture to Urban Indians
- Early Intervention
- Teach Parenting Skills
- Hire More Minority Staff Members
- Teach Families How to be Supportive
- More Wholesome Community Activities
- Youth Advocate
- More Services (i.e., advocacy, counseling, parenting, education, etc.)
- Bring People Together/Engender Commonalties
- Treat Everyone Equal-Arrest More Whites/Fewer Minorities

■ Tap into Native American Cultural to Seek Solutions

For more information on any of these reasons, see the publication “Assessment of Disproportionate Minority Contact in South Dakota” written by Gary R. Leonardson and Roland Loudenburg from Mountain Plains Research and Evaluation (2005) which is available through the South Dakota Department of Corrections.

**B Quantitative Assessment**

Although identification information and the qualitative assessment appear to be looking at similar information, the qualitative assessment allows a more meaningful look into the data. The assessment allows for a look at other factors and groups of factors that can help explain why some of the disparities exist. Although race is at the core of DMC, other factors may provide further explanations of the situations surrounding DMC.

**1 Arrest**

Arrest information for adolescents is not currently available statewide by individuals or by incidence-based, but only by summarized data. In looking at statewide arrest data for 2003, it can be noted that whites had (proportionally) more status offenses, while Native Americans had more delinquent offenses and offenses against persons. Statewide Native Americans comprised 14.1 percent of the 10-17 years old adolescents, but had 29.4 percent of the reported arrests.

<b>Statewide Population and Arrest Information for 2003 for Persons Ages 10-17</b>			
<b>Category</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Native American</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of Persons: Ages 10-17	78,236	13,223	93,466
Proportion of Persons by Race: Ages 10-17	83.7%	14.1%	
Proportion of All Offenses	67.0%	29.4%	
Proportion of Status Offenses	68.8%	28.0%	
Proportion of Delinquent Offenses	66.2%	30.1%	
Proportion of Offenses Against Persons*	57.1%	37.4%	
Total Incidents	5,744	2,521	8,570
*Crimes against Persons			
1. Murder & non-negligent manslaughter	4. Robbery	7. Sex offenses	
2. Manslaughter by negligence	5. Aggravated assault		
3. Forcible rape	6. Other assaults (simple)		

In considering types of reported offenses in 2003, there were some differences noted by race/ethnicity with more liquor law offenses reported for whites than for Native Americans and more 'All Other Offenses' for Native Americans. Marijuana was one of the 'top five' categories for whites, but not for Native Americans and simple assault was a 'top five' for Native Americans, but not for whites.

<b>Top 5 Offenses Statewide-2003</b>		
<b>White</b>	<b>Native American</b>	<b>Total</b>
5744 incidents	2521 incidents	8570 incidents
23% Liquor Laws	25% All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	22% All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)
21% All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	17% Liquor Laws	21% Liquor Laws
14% Larceny	14% Larceny	14% Larceny
9% Possession of Marijuana	8% Runaway	7% Possession of Marijuana
7% Runaway	6% Other Assaults (Simple)	7% Runaway

## 2 Detention

The table below presents the summary detention information for the three detention data sets, which are: Minnehaha County JDC, Pennington County JDC, and all other jails and JDC's. The three data sets (main, Pennington, and Minnehaha) are examined separately because of differing variables and ID designations. In this analysis, only one entry per person was used. Statewide, Native Americans comprised nearly one-

third of the total detention population for 2002. Information on Hispanics was not an option for the Pennington County JDC.

<b>Detention – 2002 One Case Per Person</b>				
<b>Race/Ethnicity Category</b>	<b>All Others Besides Minnehaha and Pennington</b>	<b>Minnehaha County JDC</b>	<b>Pennington County JDC</b>	<b>Total All Detentions</b>
Asian	0 (0.0%)	9 (1.4%)	8 (0.9%)	17 (0.9%)
Black	5 (1.2%)	46 (7.3%)	17 (2.0%)	68 (3.6%)
Hispanic	3 (0.7%)	28 (4.4%)	NA	31 (1.6%)
Native American	105 (26.0%)	139 (22.1%)	369 (42.7%)	613 (32.3%)
White	288 (71.3%)	398 (63.2%)	468 (54.2%)	1154 (60.8%)
Other/Unknown	3 (0.7%)	10 (1.6%)	2 (0.2%)	15 (0.8%)
Total	404	630	864	1898

**a) Main Detention Data Set**

In looking at detention information by ethnicity and gender, it was found that Native Americans comprised nearly 35 percent of the detained females, and about 22 percent of detained males. In examining the number of days spent in detention for those who stayed at least some time in the detention centers, it was found that Native Americans averaged more days than did whites. Native Americans had significantly greater severity of offenses, explaining some of the differences in days in detention by race.

**b) Minnehaha County Detention Information for 2002**

In looking at detention information by ethnicity and gender, it was found that Native Americans comprised 22.1 percent of the persons and 21.3 percent of the incidences, while whites accounted for 63.2 percent of the individuals and 63.6 percent of the incidences. In examining gender, it can be seen that males

outnumber females by nearly a two to one margin. There were notable exceptions for Asians and Native Americans in that there were nearly an equal proportion of males and females. There were no significant differences by gender or ethnicity in the amount of time in detention either by last occurrence or by incidences. However, severity of the offenses committed by white adolescents was significantly greater than that of Native Americans adolescents.

c) Pennington County Detention Information for 2002

In looking at detention information by ethnicity and gender, it was found that Native Americans comprised 42.7 percent of the persons and 50.1 percent of the entries in the data set, while whites account for 54.2 percent of the individuals and 46.9 percent of the 'incidences' or entries. In examining gender, it can be seen that males outnumber females by nearly a two to one margin. In looking at individuals, there are higher proportions of females for Blacks and Native Americans. In general, there was little difference by gender or ethnicity in the amount of time in detention either by individuals' last occurrence or by incidences. Males did receive significantly more days than females, based on one contact per person. Males committed significantly more severe offenses than did females, but there were no differences by race in the severity of offenses.

### **3 Adjudication of Adolescents**

Race was marginally statistically significant when considered in the two variable assessment of race and adjudicated/not adjudicated. However, when race was considered in a multivariate statistical analysis procedure it was not a significant factor in determining adjudication status. In fact, race did not meet the cutoff values needed for inclusion in the final regression equation. However, the other factors listed in the table below

were statistically significantly related with the number of times on probation and pre-hearing detention being the best variables in assessing adjudication status.

<b>Adjudicated: Statistical Procedure</b>	
<b>Factor</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Race	Race was not selected in the backward conditional method
Gender	Females more likely to be adjudicated
Circuit	Circuit 1 had higher percent; Circuit 6 lower percent adjudicated
Pre-Hearing Detention	Pre-hearing detention = greater likelihood of being adjudicated
Severity of Offense	More severe the offense = greater the likelihood of being adjudicated
Age	Younger more likely to be adjudicated
Number of Times in Probation File	More times on probation = greater likelihood of being adjudicated
Source: UJS	

#### **4 Dispositions**

To increase the validity of the results, three methods were used in the analyses of the dispositional information: 1) using all eligible entries allowing for multiple cases per person; 2) using all eligible entries allowing for multiple cases per person for the last four years; 3) and, selecting one case per person with the most severe offense used as the selection criterion (for those with more than one entry in the system).

In examining the statewide disposition results, it can be noted that overall there was only one (incarceration time) difference by race. For Method 2, Native Americans (37 days) were found to have significantly higher incarceration time than whites (30 days). The most important factors in determining time or amounts of other dispositions were severity of offense, circuit, pre-hearing detention, and age.

<b>Summary of Disposition Results-Statewide</b>				
<b>Disposition</b>	<b>Method 1: Multiple Cases All</b>	<b>Method 2: Multiple Cases- 2001-2004</b>	<b>Method 3: Most Severe Offense</b>	<b>Overall Results</b>
Detention Time	Race: p = .39	Race: p = .15	Race: p = .34	Not significant
Incarceration Time	Race: p = .06	Race: p = .04* Interaction	Race: p = .73	Not significant
Probation Time	Race: p = .57	Race: p = .50	Race: p = .26	Not significant
Community Service Time	Race: p = .93	Race: p = .72	Race: p = .73	Not significant
Fine Amount	Race: p = .51	Race: p = .23	Race: p = .11	Not significant
Restitution Amount	Race: p = .06	Race: p = .85	Race: p = .16	Not significant
Drivers License Suspended	Race: p = .57	Race: p = .49	Race: p = .11	Not significant
*Statistically significant				

## 5 Commitment to DOC

Native Americans were about twice as likely as were whites to be committed to DOC. When factors were considered, it was found that race was a significant factor after controlling for severity of offense, age, circuit, pre-hearing detention, gender, and interaction factors. Race was significant, but not as important as circuit and probation in determining DOC commitment.

In examining the rate of sentencing Native Americans to DOC by circuit, it is noted in the table below that Circuits 1 and 2 had the highest rates of Native Americans committed to DOC.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Average Rate</b>
1	2.9
2	3.6
3	1.0
4	0.9
5	2.1
6	1.8
7	1.9

## 6 Initial Placement by DOC

When looking at what factors best predict placement in secure/non-secure facilities at initial placement by DOC, five significant factors were found in the backward conditional regression procedure. The factors in order of significance were: interaction between race and gender,

disruptive behavior on school property, age, delinquent acquaintances, and prior number of convictions. The following points describe the relationships found at initial DOC placement:

- Those with delinquent acquaintances were more likely to be placed in secure facilities.
- Those with a history of disruptive behavior on school property were more likely to be placed in secure facilities.
- Those with three or more prior convictions were more likely to be placed in secure facilities.
- Those who were older were more likely to be placed in secure facilities.
- The interaction between gender and race was significant in that females and Native Americans were slightly more likely to be placed in secure facilities than were males and whites.

## **7 DOC Out-of-State Placement**

Race was significant as a single factor analysis, but race was not statistically significant in the multivariate analysis with multiple independent factors. These factors include three or more current convictions, two or more failures to comply, prior probation, inadequate supervision, some delinquent friends, substance use linked to offenses, short attention span, inadequate guilt feelings, defies authority, low achievement in school, problems with teachers, and truancy.

## **8 Placement Following Revocation of Aftercare by DOC.**

Based on information provided by the Department of Corrections, ethnicity /race was not found to be a significant factor in the revocation of aftercare. Additional analyses were not conducted with covariates because the initial results were non-significant.

#### **IV     Disproportionate Minority Contact Intervention**

As part of the DMC initiative, each state begins the challenging process of devising and implementing strategies to reduce minority overrepresentation. The overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system is the result of a multitude of factors and requires careful consideration and planning, the coordination of many stakeholders, and the implementation of varied activities to reduce it.

##### **A     Statewide**

The South Dakota DMC Committee reviewed DMC information and assessment results to determine what strategies should be implemented on a statewide basis. Based on the recommendations from the DMC Committee, the Council of Juvenile Services has adopted and has taken steps to begin implementation of the following statewide DMC intervention strategies:

- (1) Based on the DMC assessment results, the Council of Juvenile Services selected three communities in which to fund DMC interventions – Sioux Falls, Rapid City, and Sisseton. First year funding of DMC intervention projects was set at \$80,000 for both Sioux Falls and Rapid City and \$40,000 for Sisseton. The Council asked that local DMC Workgroups be formed in each of the three communities to identify local factors associated with DMC and to develop community specific intervention plans. Each of the DMC Workgroups were asked to complete their initial local assessment and submit an intervention plan by October of 2005. The Council of Juvenile Services approved of all three local DMC Intervention plans with the intention that the plans be implemented as a part of the statewide DMC plan.
- (2) Increase collaboration with Native American Tribes and the state juvenile justice system in order to access services operated by tribal entities including temporary custody, diversion, and treatment services instead of relying solely on existing state operated or contracted programs.
- (3) Assess cultural competency of agencies, departments, and systems within South Dakota through a self-assessment process. The process will be initially conducted at the three intervention sites and then on a statewide basis. The

agencies, departments and systems to participate in the self-assessment process include law enforcement, States Attorneys, diversion and teen court programs, service providers, schools, the Unified Judicial System, and the Department of Corrections. The self-assessment should include whether services are culturally relevant to the youth and their families; whether cultural components are utilized; identification of barriers to minorities to access the services; and a review of utilization, completion and success rates. Each entity will report findings on training needs and current programs and policies that would help decrease minority involvement in the juvenile justice system.

- (4) Offer cultural competency training for each agency/department/system based on needs identified through the self-assessment process. Resources to provide the training include technical assistance through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and local culturally based program and entities.
- (5) Implement data improvement projects in order to improve quantity and quality of the data currently available for the study of DMC.
- (6) Create of a legal education program be implemented for parents. The focus of the program would be on the right and responsibilities, navigating the justice system, and parenting a juvenile that is involved with the juvenile justice system.
- (7) Continue to support the three local DMC Workgroups. The Council feels that the ongoing efforts of the local Workgroups are needed to implement the interventions and to monitor DMC progress.
- (8) Research the impact on raising the compulsory school attendance age from 16 years to 18 years.
- (9) Disseminate the DMC information involving the use of PowerPoint presentations, publications, and press releases.

**B Sioux Falls/Minnehaha County**

Based on the recommendations of the DMC Committee, the Council of Juvenile Services instructed the Formula Grants staff to work with members of the Sioux Falls/Minnehaha County community to establish the Sioux Falls DMC Workgroup. This workgroup began meeting in July 2005 and submitted a plan to the DMC Committee and the Council of Juvenile Services in October. This plan identifies the services and activities that the Sioux Falls Workgroup will implement in order to decrease over-representation of minority youth within the juvenile justice system.

Minnehaha County has a juvenile population of 39,723 under the age of 18. This group is comprised of 91.3% white youth and 8.7% minority youth. Minority youth is broken down into Black (3.6%), Asian (1.7%), and Native American (3.3%). Information collected on DMC shows that the largest disparate findings are at the arrest stage with Native American juveniles.

In order to begin addressing DMC in the Sioux Falls area, the DMC Workgroup received local identification and assessment data; identified local factors associated with DMC; and decided to focus on prevention and early intervention for Native American youth and their families. A full copy of the intervention plan can be found on the DOC website. The following items are the strategies of the Sioux Falls DMC Workgroup.

- 1** Cultural Translator—Create a position that would work with the Native American children and their families upon entrance of the child to the juvenile justice system in order to help the juvenile and the family understand the juvenile justice system, realize rights and responsibilities, and provide a better understanding of the youth's and family's needs to those people working within the juvenile justice system.
- 2** Foster Care for minorities—Expand the current foster care program as an alternative to placement of juveniles in secure temporary custody. In this expansion, it is important that foster parents receive more training and education in order to help meet the needs of Minority youth.

- 3 School Retention—Increase emphasis and resources on school retention of Minority juveniles by focusing on the inclusion of cross-cultural components within the daily curriculum, culturally appropriate services for Minority juveniles, improvement of parental involvement in education, and decreasing truancy and dropouts.
- 4 Culturally Based Services—Advocate existing programs and services within the juvenile justice system to include culturally based services within their treatment programming.
- 5 Parenting Skills—Create a program to provide culturally appropriate parenting skills to Minority parents in order to prevent contact with the juvenile justice system and help them deal with some of the issues relating to contact with law enforcement and other state agencies.
- 6 Culture-specific outreach—Expand outreach activities and services for Minority families in order to help them receive appropriate services.
- 7 Cultural Competency Agency Review—Request that each department/system (law enforcement, States Attorney, teen court programs, Unified Judicial System, service providers, schools, Department of Corrections, etc.) conduct a self-assessment of their respective programs and services. The self-assessment will identify if services are culturally relevant to the youth and their families; whether cultural components are utilized; identification of existing barriers that Minorities face to access services; and a review of utilization, completion and success rates. The Workgroup will request that each entity report back any findings to the Workgroup including information on training needs and current programs and policies that would help decrease Minority involvement in the juvenile justice system.
- 8 Cultural/Diversity Training—Provide Cultural Training and education to all those that work within the juvenile justice system based on the self-review completed by the departments/agencies.
- 9 Community Awareness—Promote community awareness in order to educate the community about the juvenile justice system, the existence of

DMC, DMC activities, education of Minority cultures, and community paternalism. The workgroup will work with the local media to provide positive messages of Minority community members including both leaders and youth.

- 10** Minority Representatives in DMC—Recruit Minority leaders from within the community to serve on the local DMC Workgroup and the state DMC Committee.
- 11** Continued DMC Monitoring—Continue monitoring the system at the local level for disparities in Minority representation throughout the juvenile justice system.
- 12** Arrest Data Enhancement—Collect that local juvenile specific data from city and county law enforcement be collected and analyzed in order to get a better understanding of the juvenile arrest stage.
- 13** Temporary Custody and Detention Data Analysis—Research Minority youth admitted to temporary custody and factors that contribute to their detention.
- 14** Unified Judicial System Data—Work with UJS to improve the accuracy of data recorded in order to accurately monitor DMC rates.

## **C Rapid City/Pennington County**

Based on the recommendations of the DMC Committee, the Council of Juvenile Services instructed the Formula Grants staff to work with members of the Rapid City/Pennington County community to establish the Rapid City DMC Workgroup. This workgroup began meeting in July 2005 and submitted a plan to the DMC Committee and the Council of Juvenile Services in October. This plan identifies the services and activities that the Rapid City Workgroup will implement in order to decrease over-representation of minority youth within the South Dakota Juvenile Justice System. The following items are the strategies of the Rapid City DMC Workgroup.

Pennington County has a juvenile population of 23,550 under the age of 18. This group is comprised of 82.7% white youth and 17.3% minority youth. Minority youth is broken down into Black (2.2%), Asian (1.2%), and Native American (13.9%). Information collected on DMC shows that the largest disparate findings are at the arrest stage with Native American juveniles.

In order to begin addressing DMC in the Rapid City area, the DMC Workgroup received local identification and assessment data; identified local factors associated with DMC; and decided to focus on prevention and early intervention for Native American youth and their families. A full copy of the intervention plan can be found on the DOC website. The following items are the strategies of the Rapid City DMC Workgroup.

- 1** Rapid City Middle School Prevention Specialist—Create two positions for Middle School Prevention Specialists that would focus on providing services to Minority youth—at Dakota and North Middle Schools—who are at risk of entering the juvenile justice system.
- 2** Temporary Custody Options—Expansion of temporary custody options by the addition of shelter care and emergency foster care beds to increase the use of nonsecure holding for juveniles that are not appropriate for detention but are unable to go home; the creation of a holdover site in order to provide a short-term option while parents or guardians are being

tracked down for them to pick up their child, the creation of a juvenile detoxification center be examined which could provide short-term temporary custody options for youth that are intoxicated and need a place for detoxification who are inappropriate for many other temporary custody placements.

- 3 Alternative Schools—The Rapid City DMC Workgroup recommends an expansion of the existing alternative education opportunities.
- 4 School Retention—Implementation of a program to aid in the school retention of Minority youth through a focus on truancy, dropouts, and parental involvement.
- 5 School Setting Improvement—Work to incorporate a more therapeutic school setting for those youth who are most at risk of failing, dropping out and becoming involved in the juvenile justice system. This includes creating positions for social workers within the school; access to medical, dental, and health services; student involvement; teaching appropriate socialization skills; providing opportunities for introducing “You Can Do It” attitudes in the classroom, and cultural activities.
- 6 Parenting Skills—Create a program to teach parenting skills to Minority parents based on culturally appropriate models which would help them deal with some of the issues relating to law enforcement contact.
- 7 Accountability Programs—Work with juvenile justice programs to emphasize and encourage accountability for both the juveniles and their families through education on accountability for the actions of family members.
- 8 Family Healing Programs—Develop a program for family healing with a focus on Native American culture, beliefs, and spiritual healing.
- 9 Resource Assessment—Conduct a thorough assessment of the current community resources. The assessment would look at what programs exist, how well existing resources are being utilized, what barriers exist to accessing or completing existing services, and what gaps exist in the current programs that are offered within the community.

- 10** Outreach—Expand outreach services to Minority families in order to help them receive appropriate services.
- 11** Cultural Competency Agency Review—Request that each department/system (law enforcement, states attorney, court, service providers, etc.) conduct a self-assessment of the barriers to minorities in accessing and completing services, training needs, and current policies and practices that may impact Minority involvement in the juvenile justice system.
- 12** Law Enforcement Officer System Education—Provide training to law enforcement officers to aid in properly making decisions and referrals based on the needs of the juvenile.
- 13** Cultural/Diversity Training—Provide Cultural Training and education to all those that work within the juvenile justice system based on the self-review completed by the departments/agencies.
- 14** Community Awareness—Provide community awareness designed to educate the community about Minority cultures, juvenile justice system, existence of DMC, and DMC intervention activities.
- 15** Cultural Education in Schools—Implement more curriculum within the schools that teach culture to students in order to make them more aware of their own culture and the culture of their peers.
- 16** Minority Representatives in DMC—Recruit Minority leaders from within the community to serve on the local DMC Workgroup and the state DMC Committee.
- 17** Youth Representatives in DMC—Recruit youth from within the community to serve on the local DMC Workgroup and the state DMC Committee.
- 18** Continued DMC Monitoring—Continue monitoring the system at the local level for disparities in Minority representation throughout the juvenile justice system.

- 19** Arrest Data Enhancement—Receive and analyze local juvenile specific data from city and county law enforcement in order to get a better picture of the juvenile arrest stage.
- 20** Diversion Data—Receive and analyze local juvenile specific data from city and county diversion programs in order to get a better picture of the juveniles served by diversion programs in the area.
- 21** Juvenile Justice Juvenile Tracking—Begin to track juveniles throughout the juvenile justice system in order to identify needs of juveniles that are in contact with the system. Included in this would be data and information sharing projects including schools, law enforcement agencies, States Attorney Office, Unified Judicial System, service providers, and the Department of Corrections.
- 22** Education Information—Research communication within the education system. The focus of this information is on the movement of juveniles to and from the reservations. Specific areas include an assessment of educational needs, identification if needs are being met, identification of gaps within the system, and solutions to help meet their educational needs.

**D Sisseton/Roberts County**

Based on the recommendations of the DMC Committee, the Council of Juvenile Services instructed the Formula Grants staff to work with members of the Sisseton/Roberts County community to establish the Sisseton DMC Workgroup. This workgroup began meeting in July 2005 and submitted a plan to the DMC Committee and the Council of Juvenile Services in October. This plan identifies the services and activities that the Sisseton Workgroup will implement in order to decrease over-representation of minority youth within the South Dakota Juvenile Justice System. The following items are the strategies of the Sisseton DMC Workgroup.

Roberts County has a juvenile population of 2,882 under the age of 18. This group is comprised of 50.1% white youth and 49.9% minority youth. Minority youth is broken down into Black (0.6%), Asian (0.4%), and Native American (49.0%). Information collected on DMC shows that the largest disparate findings are at the arrest stage with Native American juveniles.

In order to begin addressing DMC in the Sisseton area, the DMC Workgroup received local identification and assessment data; identified local factors associated with DMC; and decided to focus on prevention and early intervention for Native American youth and their families. A full copy of the intervention plan can be found on the DOC website. The following items are the strategies of the Sisseton DMC Workgroup.

- 1** Minority Liaison—Creation a position for a Minority Liaison position that would work throughout the community. The person would work to promote prevention by increasing Native American involvement in positive community activities and act as a liaison between law enforcement, the youth, and the youth's family as they enter the juvenile justice system. The liaison would be able to help the juvenile and the family understand the juvenile justice system and their rights and responsibilities and provide a better understanding of the family's needs to those people working within the juvenile justice system.

- 2 Temporary Custody Options—Increase in the options available at the time of temporary custody including holdover, emergency foster care, and alcohol-holding facilities for youth too intoxicated for other temporary custody options.
- 3 Restorative Justice Program—Implement a restorative justice based program implemented within the community in order to help hold juveniles accountable for their actions.
- 4 Mentoring—Develop a mentoring program to encourage positive relationships between juveniles and adults within the community.
- 5 Mental Health Evaluations—Research options to increase availability of money for mental health evaluations to diagnose juveniles with mental health needs.
- 6 School Resource Officer—Create a Resource Officer position to be placed within the Sisseton school to help deal with issues that arise on the grounds during school time; to improve rapport between the youth and law enforcement; to increase positive interaction with officers; and to increase safety within the schools.
- 7 School Completion—Implement a program to aid in the school retention of juveniles by focusing on truancy, and dropouts, and parental involvement.
- 8 Parenting and Financial Responsibility Curriculum—Create a program within the school curriculum to teach parenting skills, financial responsibility, and violence prevention early in life to decrease problems that many face later in life.
- 9 Parenting Skills—Create a program to teach parenting skills to Minority parents based on culturally appropriate models which would help them deal with some of the issues relating to law enforcement contact.
- 10 Accountability Programs—Work with juvenile justice programs to emphasize and encourage accountability for both the juveniles and their families through education on accountability for the actions of family members.

- 11** Outreach—Expand outreach for all services, including home-based services, to Minority families in order to connect them to existing programs and resources so that they have the opportunity to receive appropriate services.
- 12** Continued DMC Monitoring—Continue monitoring the system at the local level for disparities in Minority representation throughout the juvenile justice system.
- 13** Arrest Data Enhancement—Access and analyze local juvenile specific data, from city, county, and tribal law enforcement, in order to get a better picture of the juvenile arrest stage.
- 14** Policing Policy—Work with law enforcement agencies within the Roberts County Area develop a policy against bias-based policing, provide training to officers on the policy and cultural differences, implement a procedure for complaints, and implement sanctions for officers found to have violated the policy.